

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Issues /HH-I4: Archaeology	Wayne Ormsby	63.9	Support	Supports HH-I4 and identifies the potential for Council and the Taiwhenua to work more closely on matters relating to heritage.	No relief sought.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items	Joanne Black	79.2	Amend	Opposes proposed high-density residential zoning in Napier South. Considers that the the character and history of Vigor Brown St should be preserved and protected by making the area of Vigor Brown Street between Carnell Street to Kennedy Road and Kennedy Road to Latham Street, along with Winifred Street, a general residential zone with the addition of a heritage overlay. Considers the significance of homes dating back over 100 years having survived 1931 earthquake. Considers that the building of up to a 19.5 metre apartment style dwelling next to a 100 year old Villa would completely spoil the history and character of the homes in the area. Refers to the report by architect Graham Linwood on Napier's heritage character areas which emphasizes the historic value and character of Napier South's built environment. Consider that there is concern for potential alteration of character due to attractiveness to developers for medium-density housing. Considers that councils proposed zoning disregards this report as there is no difference between the two streets with regards to the historic qualities and style and era of housing.	Amend proposed high density zone for Vigor Brown Street & Winfred Street in Napier South, to be zoned General residential with a historic overlay, like MacDonald Street between Carnell Street and Kennedy Road. Considers that there is no difference in the history or character of the homes in these streets and the council itself commissioned a report in 2019 by registered architect Graham Linwood (Heritage Review) which concluded this.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage	Rebecca Eng	99.56	Support	Transpower supports the identification of historic heritage on the basis the mapping and identification will assist with plan interpretation and application.	Retain the policy.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Tom Anderson	151.42	Amend	Supports ongoing use of heritage buildings. Notes that for such buildings to sustain their usefulness, the need to be serviced by modern infrastructure. As such, provision should be made in the Network Utilities chapter allowing for the ongoing use of heritage buildings, given that the Network Utility chapter states there should be a " a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District"	Include the objective in the NU chapter	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies	Tom Anderson	151.43	Amend	Supports and considers that a similar policy should be included in the Network Utility chapter, given that the Network Utility chapter states there should be a " a single set of rules be provided that apply across the District".	Include a similar policy in the NU chapter.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P7: Demolition and relocation	Steve Orme	153.3	Amend	Seeks to amend Policy HH-P7 to provide for demolition of a heritage building where necessary as a result of prohibitive costs faced as a result of required seismic upgrades.	Amend HH-P7 to provide for demolition of a heritage building where necessary as a result of prohibitive costs faced as a result of required seismic upgrades.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item	Steve Orme	153.4	Amend	Amend Rule HH-R10 so that the activity for demolition of a heritage item in circumstances when the cost of seismic strengthening is prohibitive is Controlled or at worst Restricted Discretionary, to be processed and determined without notification. Provide for any necessary consequential changes to the Proposed Plan. See the full submission for more detail.	Amend Rule HH-R10 so that the activity for demolition of a heritage item in circumstances when the cost of seismic strengthening is prohibitive is Controlled or at worst Restricted Discretionary, to be processed and determined without notification. Provide for any necessary consequential changes to the Proposed Plan.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria	Steve Orme	153.5	Amend	Seeks to amend the assessment criteria for the HH chapter so that it provides for the reuse of the heritage fabric of such a building in any replacement structure as one of the assessment criteria that would support the granting of consent for such demolition. See the full submission for more detail.	Amend assessment criteria for HH chapter to provide for the reuse of the heritage fabric of such a building in any replacement structure as one of the assessment criteria that would support the granting of consent for such demolition.	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage / /	Di Woods	160.1	Oppose	<p>Waiapu Cathedral has been given notice by Napier City Council that it is an Earthquake Prone building. With earthquake strengthening costs estimated to be at least \$20m, this is outside the financial capacity of the Church or Diocese and future options are now being considered by the Parish and Diocese.</p> <p>This is the third Church to be on this site and the heritage value is in the site rather than the building. Demolition may be a viable option to be considered, but changes in the Proposed Plan are likely to result in an empty building that cannot be used or strengthened (for financial reasons).</p> <p>We want to retain a place for Anglican worship in the city centre. We understand that as a Cathedral, we also have an important civic role. Over the years, we have shown how heritage associated with the expression of our faith can be retained through creative adaptation when the cathedral was rebuilt (and subsequently altered) following the 1931 earthquake and, similarly, through the evolution of the use of Ormond Chapel.</p>	<p>Seeks to make the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable any work to meet legislative requirements addressing matters of human safety (for example: earthquake strengthening works, fire safety) to be undertaken without further restriction. 2. Enable internal alterations to be undertaken and changes of use made without further restriction. If any restriction is considered necessary, this should only apply to Ormond Chapel as a Heritage NZ listed building and should relate only to the protection of that identified heritage value in that listing. 3. Enable the heritage values to be sustained in the longer term by providing a clear and cost-effective pathway for exterior alterations and demolition/rebuilding to be considered. The proposed plan provisions identify such changes as non-complying, and the policy framework uses 'avoid' wording. This sets a very high threshold and imposes additional costs through consenting to make any change at all. 	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /General /General	Di Woods	160.2	Oppose	<p>We want to retain a place for Anglican worship in the city centre. Over the years, we have shown how heritage associated with the expression of our faith can be retained through creative adaptation through the evolution of the use of Ormond Chapel.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enable any work to meet legislative requirements addressing matters of human safety (for example: earthquake strengthening works, fire safety) to be undertaken without further restriction. 2. Enable internal alterations to be undertaken and changes of use made without further restriction. If any restriction is considered necessary, this should only apply to Ormond Chapel as a Heritage NZ listed building and should relate only to the protection of that identified heritage value in that listing. 3. Enable the heritage values to be sustained in the longer term by providing a clear and cost-effective pathway for exterior alterations and demolition/rebuilding to be considered. The proposed plan provisions identify such changes as non-complying, and the policy framework uses 'avoid' wording. This sets a very high threshold and imposes additional costs through consenting to make any change at all. 	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.44	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.45	Support	Powerco supports this policy and the clarity which it provides.	Retain as drafted.	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /	Powerco Limited - Gary Scholfield	172.46	Amend	Powerco seeks additional rules specific to network utilities, to ensure the the ability for existing network utilities to be maintained or upgraded, as well as the addition of new network utilities to be provided for. These new rules could sit in the Historic Heritage rules or the Network Utility rules (with suitable cross-referencing). Utilities play an important part of the continued use or adaptive reuse of heritage items, which is supported by Objective HH-O2 and Policy HH-P3.	<p>Add new rules:</p> <p><u>HH-Rxx: Maintenance and minor upgrades of existing network utilities located on or within Group A or Group B heritage items.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>HH-Rxx: The addition of new network utilities located on Group A or Group B heritage items.</u></p> <p><u>Activity Status: Controlled</u></p> <p><u>Matters of control are restricted to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Streetscape values;</u> <u>2. Effects on heritage values;</u> <u>3. Visual effects;</u> <u>4. Adaptive reuse, and</u> <u>5. Cumulative effects.</u> 	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Tania Diack	191.2	Amend	Policy HH-P3 addresses demolition and partial demolition of scheduled heritage sites. The current policy enables consideration of "serious and immediate threat to property, people or services". However, there is no consideration of demolition to mitigate the high risk of natural hazards over the medium-long term, for example the application of Category 3 to land where there is serious risk to life from future flood events. This should be a relevant consideration in assessment of resource consents to demolish heritage buildings in these areas.	Amend the wording of Policy HH-P3 to enable consideration of longer term as well as immediate serious threats from natural hazards.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item	Tania Diack	191.3	Amend	Assessment criteria HH-AC6 addresses demolition and partial demolition of Group B scheduled heritage sites. The current criteria enables consideration of whether the heritage item in its current state poses a safety risk, including loss of life, in the event of an earthquake. However, there is no consideration of potential safety issues from buildings and property from other natural hazards, such as high intensity rainfall events. For example, occupation and use of heritage scheduled residential buildings within Category 3 would cause serious risk to life from future flood events. This should be a relevant consideration in assessment of resource consents to demolish heritage buildings in these areas.	Amend the wording of Assessment criteria HH-AC6 to enable consideration of the effects from all natural hazards, not just earthquakes as currently drafted.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /	Fleur Lincoln Napier City Council	196.42	Amend	Consistent with Policy HH-P3, Council wishes to enable continued use on buildings for modern activities, including encouraging the use of solar panels, on heritage items provided that heritage values are not compromised.	<p>Add new permitted activity rule (for both contributory and non-contributory sites):</p> <p>Minor external alterations to any Group A or Group B heritage item that are associated with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) Security alarms ii) Security lighting iii) Any attachment that is not visible from a road or public space, excluding signage 	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /General	Sue and Howard Dick and Pilgrim	261.1	Oppose	Seeks to delete Item 198 from Schedule 3 of the PDP for the following reasons: - there is no benefit to the owners and will make maintenance more costly and difficult - ratepayers should contribute to the cost of retention and maintenance of the buildings if there is a benefit to them of the buildings retention None of the buildings have been demolished in over 140 years. With the majority of homes now with an owner-occupier status, those owning the homes retain them because they value their heritage status - A heritage status may make the homes difficult to sell Initially attracted to the policy that prevented demolition, however now consider there is no need for this given each of the properties value and size, and the lack of evidence of a developer looking to purchase multiple properties making the risk of demolition and redevelopment low	We seek removal of Schedule 3 item 198 from the Napier City Proposed District Plan	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Introduction	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.27	Support	Supports Historical and Cultural Values / HH - Historic Heritage Introduction and in particular supports the three aims (a - c) that historic heritage provisions seek to achieve.	Retain Historical and Cultural Values / HH - Historic Heritage Introduction as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Issues /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.28	Support	Supports HH - Historic Heritage Issues as HNZPT considers these are the key historic heritage issues in the Napier region; in particular HNZPT supports the statement at HH-14: Archaeology may be lost through the development / redevelopment of sites and through land use activities, which is a useful summary of archaeology as a resource issue in New Zealand.	Retain HH - Historic Heritage Issues Section as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.29	Support	Supports Objective HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation.	Retain Objective HH-O1: Historic heritage preservation.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.30	Support	Supports HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation.	Retain HH-O2: Continued use and appreciation.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.31	Support	HNZPT supports HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items however, the 'streetscapes and groups' should be more clearly linked with the Precincts and Overlays identified in Schedule 4.	Retain Objective HH-O3: Historic heritage streetscapes and groups of buildings and items with the following minor amendment: The historic heritage values of the identified streetscapes and groups <u>overlays and precincts identified in Schedule 4</u> , including the contribution...	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Objectives /HH-O4: Archaeological sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.32	Support	Supports Objective HH-O4: Archaeological sites as it proposes identification.	Retain Objective HH-O4: Archaeological sites as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.33	Support	Supports Policy HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage as HNZPT supports the list of qualities identified in this Policy.	Retain Policy HH-P1: Identification and classification of historic heritage in its entirety.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.34	Support	The submitter supports Policy HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values as it refers to the protection and maintenance of heritage values.	Retain Policy HH-P2: Protection and maintenance of heritage values as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P3: Continued use	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.35	Support	Supports HH-P3: Continued use Policy with its reference for continued and alternative uses, where the activity does not compromise heritage values.	Retain HH-P3: Continued use as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.36	Amend	Considers that HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups should be amended as the 'streetscapes and groups' should be more clearly linked with the Precincts and Overlays identified in Schedule 4.	Amend HH-P5: Streetscapes and groups as follows: Retain the character and integrity of historic streetscapes and groups of buildings and items <u>(as identified in the overlays and precincts identified in Schedule 4), by ...</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P6: Safety improvements	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.37	Amend	Supports Policy HH-P6: Safety improvements that provide for safety alterations, without compromising heritage values.	Retain Policy HH-P6: Safety improvements in its entirety.	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P7: Demolition and relocation	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.38	Oppose	Opposes Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation as the term significant public benefit is not defined in the PDP, and it is ambiguous and is open for interpretation. A number of new developments could potentially argue "significant public benefit" from an increase in housing or commercial floorspace supply. The policy mentions exploring alternatives but does not say that an application has to show that retention is not feasible, but that it has merely considered/explored other options. Reference to 'taking into account possible future technology advances' in clause 4 is considered problematic. It is ambiguous as to what may or may not be possible in the future.	Amend Policy HH-P7: Demolition and relocation as follows: Avoid total or partial demolition or relocation of historic heritage items and elements of significant heritage values unless: 1. The demolition or relocation is required to allow for significant public benefit: a. that could not otherwise be achieved, and b. where the significant public benefit outweighs the retention of the historic heritage item or parts of the heritage item; and/or 2. The partial demolition is necessary.... 3. It is necessary to prevent serious ... 4. for clauses 1, 2 and 3 above, all other reasonable alternatives to retain the heritage item have been explored, taking into account possible future technological advances; and ... There are no reasonable alternatives to relocation, partial demolition, or total demolition; and 5. An archaeological authority ...	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.39	Support	Supports Policy HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites but considers an amendment is necessary as there is a typo whereby the hyperlink to the definition of 'site' needs to be amended, and instead link to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Retain Policy HH-P8: Identification and management of archaeological sites but amend the hyperlink.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.40	Amend	Considers HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives is supported subject to an amendment to the hyperlink definition of 'site' that instead links to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Retain Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives with an amendment to the hyperlink to a (new) definition of 'archaeological site'.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Policies /HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.41	Support	The submitter supports HH - Historic Heritage - Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives as a policy which encourages the use of non-regulatory incentives is supported.	Retain HH - Historic Heritage - Policy HH-P9: Non-regulatory incentives as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R1: Maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.42	Oppose	The submitter opposes Rule HH-R1: Maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as the range of works covered should be split up into multiple rules for improved clarity and readability. A permitted activity status for maintenance and repair (interior or exterior) of Group 1 and 2 heritage items is supported. A requirement to cause 'no damage' to the heritage item is potentially overly strict. No permanent damage would be a more reasonable standard.	Amend HH-R1: maintenance and repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as follows: HH-R1: Maintenance and Repair to the interior and/or exterior of a Group A or Group B heritage item. ; internal alterations, and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item Where the following activity conditions are met: 1. Any materials removed to carry out the repairs must be limited to the amount necessary to carry out the works. 2. There must be no <u>permanent</u> damage to the heritage item. when undertaking the repairs and maintenance, and protective material must be used when necessary to prevent damage. HH-R1B <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> 1. The extent of loss of heritage fabric and the extent of adverse effects on heritage values, including damage arising from scaffolding damage, and 2. The contents of any conservation plan for the heritage item. New Rule for alterations: HH-RX Internal alterations and internal safety alterations to Group B heritage items Activity Status: Permitted Where the following activity conditions are met: 1. Internal alterations do not result in new internal walls or floor levels visible from the exterior of the	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.43	Amend	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) considers Rule HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item should be amended as while it supports the need for a structural engineering assessment to be included in a resource consent for this work, concern is raised [about] the wording of the note.	Amend Rule HH-R3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item as follows: Note: An application under this rule must be accompanied by: A structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer must accompany the application. Where this is not supplied, work will be assessed as an 'alteration' as it fails to meet the definition of 'safety alteration'.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.44	Support	Considers HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item as the Restricted Activity Status and matters of discretion for this activity are supported. However, to be consistent with HH-R3, a note should be added about need for a structural engineering assessment.	Retain HH-R4: Internal or external safety alterations to a Group A heritage item with an amendment as follows: <u>Note: An application under this rule must be accompanied by a structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer.</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.45	Oppose	Opposes HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item as considers the Definition of 'Alteration or Addition' needs to be amended as a very broad definition for alteration is proposed, which potentially extends far beyond the common word usage of the word 'alteration'. Provisions which potentially disguise a significant volume of 'partial demolition' under a more oblique term, could potentially encourage demolition in stages.	Retain HH-R5: External alterations (excluding safety alterations) and/or additions to any Group B heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.46	Support	Supports HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item as the activity status for this type of work is supported.	Retain HH-R6: Internal or external alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.47	Amend	The submitter supports Rule HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item with regards to the activity status for the demolition and partial demolition of Group 1 and 2 Heritage items. It is noted that the current definition of partial demolition, excludes the demolition of up to 30% of the heritage building regardless of location or condition. It is considered that the definition of partial demolition should be amended, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R8: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group B heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.48	Amend	Considers Rule HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item while supported should be amended regarding the definition of partial demolition, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R10: Demolition, including partial demolition, of a Group A heritage item.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.49	Amend	The submitter supports Rule HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for with regards to the activity status for the demolition and partial demolition of Group 1 and 2 Heritage items. It is noted that the current definition of partial demolition, excludes the demolition of up to 30% of the heritage building regardless of location or condition. It is considered that the definition of partial demolition should be amended, so that for example the demolition of building facades is assessed under Rules HH-R8 and HH-R10.	Retain Rule HH-R11: Activities not otherwise provided for.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.50	Support	Supports Rule HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as HNZPT supports these rules controlling relocation of heritage items.	Retain Rule HH-R7: Relocation of a Group B heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries Activity Status: Non-complying NA	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.51	Support	Supports HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as HNZPT supports these rules controlling relocation of heritage items.	Retain Rule HH-R9: Relocation of a Group A heritage item within or beyond the property boundaries as notified.	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table /General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.52	Oppose	Opposes HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table as sites containing heritage buildings can often contain accessory buildings such as storage sheds and garages. It is important to manage the location and appearance of new buildings, to ensure they do not adversely affect the setting of scheduled heritage items. Small accessory buildings, appropriately located, should be able to be established as a permitted activity, while there should be a consenting pathway for other buildings, allowing the effects on heritage values to be considered.	<p>Seeks to amend HH - Historic Heritage - Rules Table with a new Rule as follows:</p> <p>HH-XX: New buildings and structures on sites containing Group A or B heritage items. Activity status: Permitted Where the following activity conditions are met:</p> <p>A new building is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessory to an existing residential unit; 2. Located behind the front façade of the primary building 3. Is physically detached from the primary building 4. Construction works have no direct or indirect effect on the primary building 5. the building has a floor area of no more than 10m2 and a height less than 3m. <p>Activity status where activity conditions are not met: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. compatibility with the scale, form, proportion, design and materials of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. Effect on relationship of the heritage building or heritage structure with its setting; 3. any temporary construction effects 4. Streetscape values 5. Visual effects 6. Cumulative effects 	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC1: Maintenance and repair and internal alterations and/or internal safety alterations to a Group B heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.53	Amend	Considers that to be consistent with the HNZPT submission point on HH-R1, separate HH-AC1 into two sections. As the Napier Art Deco Design Guide may not be relevant to all heritage items, the Council may wish to add the words 'where applicable' to clause d. Regarding point (e) – conservation plans – the phrasing of this clause could be clearer, and refer to the extent to which the work is consistent with the contents of any conservation plan for the building or structure. With regards to internal safety and other alterations, the assessment criteria should refer to the extent to which the internal alterations or safety alterations result in changes to interior walls or floors which are visible from the exterior of the building, and the extent to which the alterations adversely impact on the heritage values of the place.	<p>Amend HH-AC1 as follows:</p> <p>d. the extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide, <u>where applicable.</u></p> <p>e. Whether a conservation plan prepared by a suitably qualified heritage professional has been prepared to inform the work being undertaken (where appropriate). <u>The extent to which the work is consistent with the contents of any conservation plan for the building or structure (where applicable).</u></p> <p>f. <u>The extent to which the internal alterations or safety alterations result in changes to interior walls or floors which are visible from the exterior of the building, and the extent to which the alterations adversely impact on the heritage values of the place.</u></p>	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.54	Amend	The submitter considers HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item HH-R4 should be amended as whilst the intent of the assessment criteria is supported, HNZPT recommends several amendments to improve the meaning of the criteria, and to delete unnecessary repetition. Clause d reads as an explanatory note and not a assessment criteria. Under clause e, it would be preferable to also refer to significant external features Clauses f, j and m are a repeat of clause b. Amendments to clauses n and q have also been suggested, to aid in clarity and meaning.	Amend HH-AC3: External safety alterations to a Group B heritage item HH-R3; External or internal safety alterations to a Group A heritage item HH-R4 as follows: <u>Advice Note:</u> d. The extent of the alterations and the relative significance of the heritage item will determine the scale of heritage assessment required, or whether a conservation plan is preferred prior to the work being carried out. e. The extent to which significant original interior finishes <u>and external features</u> will be retained f. The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide. j. The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide. m. The extent to which the work is being undertaken in a manner consistent with the Napier Art Deco Design Guide. n. Recommendations contained in a Whether the building has been subject to a detailed structural engineering assessment by a chartered professional engineer. This should.....alterations. q. The extent to which the work enables <u>the continuation of the existing use, previous use or alternative use of the heritage item; compatible, original, and new adaptive uses.</u>	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.55	Support	Supports HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5 as assessment criteria contain a variety of relevant matters covering both potentially adverse and positive effects.	Retain HH-AC4: Internal or external alteration (excluding safety alterations) to a Group A heritage item HH-R6; External alterations (excluding safety alterations) to a Group B heritage item HH-R5 as notified.	Open Submission
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.56	Amend	The submitter considers HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7 should be amended as assessment criteria which focuses on the need for relocation are supported. [However] it is noted that a number of assessment criteria do not read as criteria but policy or notes. Alternative wording is suggested to put points in a criteria framework.	Amend HH-AC5: Relocation of a Group B heritage item HH-R7 as follows: i. Any genuine threat to the heritage item that prevents retention of the heritage item in its current location which should be documented. ii. Whether the new location should allows an und erstanding of the remaining significance of the heritage item ... iii. Whether relocation enables future preservation of the heritage item will be provided through a compatible use, improved physical condition, appropriate context or surroundings, and protection from vandalism and fire. iv. Whether a heritage item was designed to be relocatable or relocation has been a feature of its history, relocation may in some circumstances be appropriate. However, a full assessment of the potential effects of relocation should, nevertheless, be carried out. v. Whether R relocation <u>affects the relationship of the heritage item with a wider group of historic buildings and structures. Should be informed by the concept of greater or total conservation benefit with respect to a large complex group of structures and buildings. It may be that the removal of minor structures may be justified to achieve the conservation of the most significant places on the entire site.</u> vi. What All other alternatives should be assessed before to relocation is were considered (e.g. funding sources) and all decisions must be informed by a heritage assessment or conservation plan, where one exists, and archaeological advice.	Open Submission

HH - Historic Heritage

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
HH - Historic heritage /Assessment criteria /HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Dean Raymond	273.57	Support	Supports HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8 as assessment criteria are considered appropriate. It is noted that assessment criteria are equally relevant to the demolition/partial demolition of Group 1 heritage items.	Retain HH-AC6: Demolition of a Group B heritage item HH-R8 as notified.	Open Submission